arXiv:1704.05772v2 [astro-ph.CO] 22 Apr 2017

A power-law coupled three-form dark energy model

Yan-Hong Yao,[1,*] Yang-Jie Yan,[1,†] and Xin-He Meng[1,‡]

[1] *Department of Physics, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, China*

Abstract

We consider a field theory model of coupled dark energy which treats dark energy as a three-form field and dark matter as a spinor field. By assuming the effective mass of dark matter as a power-law function of the three-form field and neglecting the potential term of dark energy, we obtain three solutions of the autonomous system of evolution equations, including a de Sitter attractor, a tracking solution and an approximate solution which shows that the effective EOS of dark energy can pass through -1 at a low redshift that depends on the coupling constant λ. To understand the strength of the coupling, we confront the model with the latest Type Ia Supernova (SN Ia), Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO) and Cosmic Microwave Backround (CMB) radiation observations, with the conclusion that the combination of these three databases marginalized over the present dark matter density parameter Ω_{m0} and the present three-form field κX_0 gives stringent constraints on the coupling constant, $-0.017 < \lambda < 0.047$ (2σ confidence level), by which we give out the model applicable parameter range.

* Yohann@mail.nankai.edu.cn

† yan_yj@mail.nankai.edu.cn

‡ xhm@nankai.edu.cn

I. INTRODUCTION

According to cosmological observations, the universe has entered a stage of an accelerated expansion with a redshift smaller than 1[1, 2]. Since all usual types of matter with positive pressure decelerate the expansion of the universe, a sector with negative pressure named as dark energy was suggested to account for the invisible fuel that accelerates the expansion rate of the current universe[3, 4].

The simplest cosmological model of dark energy is the so called Lambda cold dark matter (ΛCDM) model, in which vacuum energy plays the role of dark energy. Although ΛCDM model provides an excellent fit to a wide range of astronomical data so far, such model in fact is theoretical problematic since its conclusion that vacuum density is coincidentally comparable with the critical density at the present epoch in the long history of the universe is hard to be accepted. In order to alleviate this coincidence problem, various of evolving and spatially homogeneous scalar field, including quintessence[5], phantom[6], dilatonic[7], tachyon[8]and quintom[9] etc., were suggested to take vacuum energy's place. In these models, the resolution of the coincidence problem typically leads to a fine-tuning of model parameters.

Since the experimental evidences of the fundamental scalar particles have not been discovered yet, there is no reason to exclude the possibility of some other high form field to be dark energy. Indeed, the three-form cosmology proposed in[10, 11] could be a good alternative to scalar cosmology, because such high form field not only respects the Friedmann-Robertson-Walker(FRW) symmetry naturally but also can accelerates the expansion rate of the current universe without a slow-roll condition.

The coincidence problem mentioned above is just that the amount of dark matter is comparable to that of dark energy in the present universe, so it is natural to consider an interaction between these two components. As was pointed out in the paper[12], in comparison to coupled scalar dark energy model[13], some new features appear in coupled three-form dark energy model, including one that the stress tensor is modified by the interaction between two dark sectors, hence it is problematic to consider a coupled three-form dark energy model in a phenomenological way[14], and one needs to construct it in a Lagrangian formalism.Different from modeling dark matter as point particles[12], we follow the thread that describing the interaction between dark energy and dark matter from a fundamental field

theory point of view[15] and consider dark matter as a Dirac spinor field.

The contents of this paper are as follows. In section II, we present a type of Lagrangians describing the interaction between a three-form field and a Dirac spinor field in curve space-time and then derive the field equations from such Lagrangians. In section III, we consider these field equations in a FRW space-time by assuming the effective mass of dark matter as a power-law function of the three-form field and setting the potential of dark energy to be zero. In section IV, we carry out a simple likelihood analysis of the model with the use of 580 SN Ia data points from recently released Union2.1 compilation[16] and BAO data from the WiggleZ Survey[17], SDSS DR7 Galaxy sample [18]and 6dF Galaxy Survey datasets[19], together with CMB data from WMAP7 observations[20]. In the last section, we make a brief conclusion with this paper.

II. A TYPE OF FIELD THEORIES OF THREE-FORM AND DIRAC SPINOR IN CURVE SPACE-TIME

This section involves some concepts that are used to include fermionic sources in the Einstein theory of gravitation and for a more detailed analysis the reader is referred to[21–24].

A type of Lagrangians which describe the interaction between a canonical three-form field $A_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$ with a potential $V(A^2)$ and a Dirac spinor field ψ in a curve space-time can be constructed as

$$\mathcal{L}_m = -\frac{1}{48}F^2 - V(A^2) + \frac{i}{2}[\bar{\psi}\Gamma^\mu D_\mu\psi - D_\mu\bar{\psi}\Gamma^\mu\psi] - \bar{\psi}M(A_{\alpha\beta\gamma}\Gamma^\alpha\Gamma^\beta\Gamma^\gamma\Gamma^5)\psi \tag{1}$$

where $F = dA$ represents the field strength tensor and D_μ is the covariant derivative of spinor which satisfies

$$D_\mu\psi = \partial_\mu\psi + \Omega_\mu\psi \tag{2}$$

$$D_\mu\bar{\psi} = \partial_\mu\bar{\psi} - \bar{\psi}\Omega_\mu \tag{3}$$

The $\Omega_\mu = \frac{1}{2}\omega_{\mu ab}\Sigma^{ab}$ appeared in (2),(3) denotes the spin connection which is constituted by the Ricci spin coefficients $\omega_{\mu ab} = e^\nu_a\nabla_\mu e_{\nu b}$ and the generators of the spinor representation of the Lorentz group $\Sigma^{ab} = \frac{1}{4}[\gamma^a, \gamma^b]$. γ^a and $\Gamma^\mu = e^\mu_a\gamma^a$ are the Dirac-Pauli matrices and their curve space-time counterparts respectively, while $\Gamma^5 = -i\sqrt{-g}\Gamma^0\Gamma^1\Gamma^2\Gamma^3 = i\gamma^0\gamma^1\gamma^2\gamma^3 = \gamma^5$. Following the general covariance principle, the tetrad e^ν_a is related to the metric by $g^{\mu\nu} =$

$e^{\mu}_{a}e^{\nu}_{b}\eta^{ab}$ with $\eta^{ab} = diag(1,-1,-1,-1)$. In such Lagrangians, the coupling between two fields is demonstrated by the the matrix function $M(A_{\alpha\beta\gamma}\Gamma^{\alpha}\Gamma^{\beta}\Gamma^{\gamma}\Gamma^{5})$.

One now can obtains the field equations from the total action

$$S[g,\psi,\bar{\psi}] = \int \mathcal{L}\sqrt{-g}d^{4}x \tag{4}$$

where $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{g} + \mathcal{L}_{m} = \frac{R}{2\kappa^{2}} + \mathcal{L}_{m}$ is the Lagrangian including gravity, R denotes the Ricci scalar and $\kappa = \sqrt{8\pi G}$ is the inverse of the reduced Planck mass.

By varying the total action with respect to the three-form field and the Dirac field, we have the following equations of motion which are quite similar to that of electrodynamics

$$\nabla_{\alpha}F^{\alpha\mu\nu\rho} = 12\frac{dV}{dA^{2}}A^{\mu\nu\rho} + 6\bar{\psi}\frac{\partial M}{\partial A_{\mu\nu\rho}}\psi \tag{5}$$

$$iD_{\alpha}\bar{\psi}\Gamma^{\alpha} + \bar{\psi}M = 0 \tag{6}$$

$$-i\Gamma^{\alpha}D_{\alpha}\psi + M\psi = 0 \tag{7}$$

The variation of the action with respect to the tetrad leads to Einstein field equation

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}R = -\kappa^{2}T_{\mu\nu} \tag{8}$$

where the total energy-momentum tensor for two fields is given by

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\mu\nu} =& -\frac{1}{6}F_{\mu\alpha\beta\gamma}F_{\nu}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} - 6\frac{dV}{dA^{2}}A_{\mu}^{\alpha\beta}A_{\nu\alpha\beta} \\ &+ \frac{i}{4}(\bar{\psi}\Gamma_{\mu}D_{\nu}\psi + \bar{\psi}\Gamma_{\nu}D_{\mu}\psi - D_{\mu}\bar{\psi}\Gamma_{\nu}\psi - D_{\nu}\bar{\psi}\Gamma_{\mu}\psi) \\ &- \frac{1}{2}(A_{\mu\beta\gamma}g_{\alpha\nu} + A_{\nu\beta\gamma}g_{\alpha\mu} + A_{\alpha\mu\gamma}g_{\beta\nu} + A_{\alpha\nu\gamma}g_{\beta\mu} \\ &+ A_{\alpha\beta\mu}g_{\gamma\nu} + A_{\alpha\beta\nu}g_{\gamma\mu})\bar{\psi}\frac{\partial M}{\partial A_{\alpha\beta\gamma}}\psi - g_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{L}_{m}. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

III. COSMOLOGICAL EVOLUTION OF THE POWER-LAW COUPLED THREE-FORM DARK ENERGY MODEL

We now consider the field equations in a homogeneous, isotropic, and spatially flat spacetime described by the metric

$$ds^{2} = dt^{2} - a(t)^{2}d\vec{x}^{2} \tag{10}$$

where $a(t)$ refers to the scale factor.

To be compatible with FRW symmetries, the three-form field is assumed as the time-like component of the dual vector field, i.e.

$$A_{ijk} = X(t)a(t)^3\varepsilon_{ijk} \tag{11}$$

Since a three-form field without a potential can accelerates the expansion rate of the current universe[1], for simplicity, we set the potential to be zero in the following discussions, together with choosing the coupling matrix function as the following power-law form

$$M = m\left[\left(\frac{i\kappa}{6}A_{\mu\nu\rho}\Gamma^\mu\Gamma^\nu\Gamma^\rho\Gamma^5\right)^2\right]^{\frac{\lambda}{2}} = m(\kappa X)^\lambda \tag{12}$$

we have the Friedmann equations

$$H^2 = \frac{\kappa^2}{3}\rho \tag{13}$$

$$\dot{H} = -\frac{\kappa^2}{2}(\rho + p) \tag{14}$$

with

$$\rho = T^0_0 = g^{00}T_{00} = \frac{1}{2}(3HX + \dot{X})^2 + m(\kappa X)^\lambda\bar{\psi}\psi \tag{15}$$

$$p = -T^i_i = -g^{ii}T_{ii} = -\frac{1}{2}(3HX + \dot{X})^2 + \lambda m(\kappa X)^\lambda\bar{\psi}\psi \tag{16}$$

M then can be seen as the effective mass of dark matter, and m is a constant with mass dimension which is, in fact, the mass of dark matter in a free field theory, while λ is a dimensionless constant representing the strength of the coupling which, as we will see in the next section, can be strictly restricted by recent observations.

In the FRW space-time, there is only one independent equation of motion of the three-form field

$$\ddot{X} + 3(\dot{H}X + H\dot{X}) + \lambda\kappa m(\kappa X)^{\lambda-1}\bar{\psi}\psi = 0 \tag{17}$$

from the equations of motion of the spinor field and its Dirac adjoint, one can obtains the following equation

$$\frac{d(\bar{\psi}\psi)}{dt} + 3H(\bar{\psi}\psi) = 0 \tag{18}$$

with its simple solution

$$\bar{\psi}\psi = (\bar{\psi}\psi)_0 a^{-3} \tag{19}$$

[1] A three-form field without a potential is equivalent to a cosmological constant.

which shows that our model indeed returns to ΛCDM model when the coupling constant λ becomes 0.

Providing with the equations of motion, we have the continuity equations for both components

$$\dot{\rho}_X + 3H(\rho_X + p_X) = -\delta H \rho_m \tag{20}$$

$$\dot{\rho}_m + 3H(\rho_m + p_m) = \delta H \rho_m \tag{21}$$

with

$$\rho_X = \frac{1}{2}(3HX + \dot{X})^2, \qquad p_X = p \tag{22}$$

$$\rho_m = m(\kappa X)^\lambda \bar{\psi}\psi, \qquad p_m = 0 \tag{23}$$

$$\delta = \lambda \frac{X'}{X} \tag{24}$$

the prime stands for derivative with respect to e-folding time $N = \ln a$ here and in the following.

In order to study cosmological dynamics in such coupled dark energy model, it is convenient to introduce the following dimensionless variable[25]

$$x = \kappa X, \qquad y = \frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{6}}(X' + 3X), \qquad \omega^2 = \frac{\kappa^2 \rho_m}{3H^2}. \tag{25}$$

By applying the Friedmann equations and equations of motion, one can obtains the autonomous system of evolution equations

$$x' = \sqrt{6}y - 3x \tag{26}$$

$$y' = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\lambda}{x}\left(\sqrt{6} - 3xy\right) - 3y\right)\left(y^2 - 1\right). \tag{27}$$

We note that ω^2 has been eliminated by the Friedmann constraint written in terms of these variables $y^2 + \omega^2 = 1$.

There are two fixed points for such autonomous system[2]. One of them is $\left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}, 1\right)$, which is an attractor since its eigenvalues $(-3, -3)$ are both negative. By rewriting density and pressure in term of the dimensionless variables, we have the total EOS

$$\omega_{tot} = \frac{p}{\rho} = -1 + (1 + \lambda)\left(1 - y^2\right) = -1 \tag{28}$$

[2] Actually there are four, but since the system encounters singularity when x equals to 0, so the physical processes must only happen in the region of the phase space which satisfies $x > 0$ or $x < 0$, without losing any generality, we consider the former probability in our discussions.



FIG. 1. The larger black point represents the stable point,and the smaller one represents the saddle point.

indicating that such fixed point represents a three-form saturated de Sitter universe. The other one $\left(\sqrt{\frac{2\lambda}{3(1+\lambda)}}, \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{(1+\lambda)}}\right)$ with eigenvalues $\frac{3}{4}\left(\left(-1+\sqrt{17}\right), \left(-1-\sqrt{17}\right)\right)$ is a saddle point, strictly this fixed point exists only when $\lambda > 0$. It can be inferred from $\omega_X = \frac{p_X}{\rho_X} = -1 + \frac{\lambda\left(1-y^2\right)}{y^2} = 0$, $\delta = 0$ that such fixed point is a tracking solution which can be used to alleviate the coincidence problem with a fine-turning of the model parameters.

The trajectories with respect to $x(N)$ and $y(N)$ with a wide range of initial conditions and a assumption that $\lambda = 0.01$ (we will see that this is a good choice in the next section) can be visualized by Fig.1.

As is showed in the Fig.1, the trajectories run toward the de Sitter attractor, coasting along the saddle point. Also, one should note that the present value of x must be equal to or larger than a certain value x_* that depends on both λ and Ω_{m0} to make sure in high redshift the autonomous system does not encounter singularity, which means the likelihood function of $(x_0, \lambda, \Omega_{m0})$ suddenly jump to zero when x below x_*.

Now let us solve the the autonomous system of evolution equations by assuming a large

x_0. With the constraint $y^2 < 1$, it can be well approximated by two independent equations

$$x' = -3x \tag{29}$$

$$y' = \frac{3}{2}(1+\lambda)y(1-y^2) \tag{30}$$

which have the following solutions

$$x \approx x_0(1+z)^3 \tag{31}$$

$$y^2 \approx \frac{1}{1+\frac{\Omega_{m0}}{1-\Omega_{m0}}(1+z)^{3(1+\lambda)}} \tag{32}$$

we have replaced e-folding time by the redshift here.

Substituting the solutions into(22)and(24), we have

$$\rho_X \approx \frac{3H_0^2(1-\Omega_{m0})}{\kappa^2} \tag{33}$$

$$p_X \approx -\frac{3H_0^2(1-\Omega_{m0})}{\kappa^2} + \lambda\frac{3H_0^2\Omega_{m0}}{\kappa^2}(1+z)^{3(1+\lambda)} \tag{34}$$

$$\delta \approx -3\lambda \tag{35}$$

noting that although δ is a constant, such solutions are different from the models proposed in[26–28] since

$$\omega_X \approx -1 + \lambda\frac{\Omega_{m0}}{1-\Omega_{m0}}(1+z)^{3(1+\lambda)} \tag{36}$$

is not a constant.

It can be inferred from (35) and (36) that the energy transfer between two dark sectors keeps the density of dark energy as a constant even when its EOS deviates from -1.

To compare the solutions with uncoupled dark energy model, let us rewrite Hubble parameter as

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{H^2(z)}{H_0^2} &= \frac{\Omega_{m0}\left(\frac{x}{x_0}\right)^{\lambda}(1+z)^3}{1-y^2} \\ &= \Omega_{m0}(1+z)^3 + (1-\Omega_{m0})\frac{\rho_{Xeff}}{\rho_{Xeff0}}\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\rho_{Xeff}}{\rho_{Xeff0}} &= \frac{\Omega_{m0}}{1-\Omega_{m0}}\left(\frac{\left(\frac{x}{x_0}\right)^{\lambda}(1+z)^3}{1-y^2} - (1+z)^3\right) \\ &= \exp\left[\int_0^z \frac{3(1+\omega_{Xeff}(\tilde{z}))}{1+\tilde{z}}d\tilde{z}\right]\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

is the normalized effective dark energy density and

$$\omega_{Xeff}(z) = -1 + \frac{1}{3}\frac{x^{\lambda}\left(3+\frac{\lambda(1+z)}{x}\frac{dx}{dz}\right)(1-y^2)+(1+z)\frac{dy^2}{dz}x^{\lambda}-3(1-y^2)^2x_0^{\lambda}}{\left(x^{\lambda}-(1-y^2)x_0^{\lambda}\right)(1-y^2)}. \tag{39}$$

is the effective EOS of dark energy.

By substituting the approximate solutions into (38) and (39), we have

$$\frac{\rho_{Xeff}}{\rho_{Xeff0}} \approx 1 + \frac{\Omega_{m0}}{1-\Omega_{m0}}\left((1+z)^{3(1+\lambda)} - (1+z)^3\right) \tag{40}$$

$$\omega_{Xeff} \approx \frac{-1+\lambda\frac{\Omega_{m0}}{1-\Omega_{m0}}(1+z)^{3(1+\lambda)}}{1+\frac{\Omega_{m0}}{1-\Omega_{m0}}\left((1+z)^{3(1+\lambda)}-(1+z)^3\right)} \tag{41}$$

as one can see, the effective energy density of dark energy is proportional to $(1+z)^{3(1+\lambda)}$ at high redshift, which also can be inferred from $\omega_{Xeff} \to \lambda$ when $z \to +\infty$. By setting ω_{Xeff} equal to -1, we can obtain the redshift $\tilde{z}$ at which the effective EOS of dark energy pass through -1

$$\tilde{z} \approx (1+\lambda)^{-\frac{1}{3}} - 1 \approx -\frac{1}{3}\lambda \tag{42}$$

which shows that if λ is a small negative constant, the effective EOS of dark energy can pass through -1 at a low redshift.

At the end of this section, we place another restriction on the likelihood function of $(x_0, \lambda, \Omega_{m0})$ with the aid of the approximate solution of the autonomous system of evolution equations, in fact we can see from (40) and (41)immediately that the Hubble parameter is independent of x_0 supposing x_0 take a large value,which means that the likelihood function becomes a none zero constant(in fact a large x_0 with proper values of λ andΩ_{m0} is quite favored by observations) with respect to x_0 if x_0 is large enough. Given this behavior of the likelihood function L, we have such formula

$$\int_{x_*}^{\infty} L(x_0, \lambda, \Omega_{m0}) dx_0 \propto \lim_{x_0 \to +\infty} L(x_0, \lambda, \Omega_{m0}) \tag{43}$$

which can be used to marginalize over x_0.

IV. CONFRONT THE POWER-LAW COUPLED THREE-FORM DARK ENERGY MODEL WITH OBSERVATIONS

In this section, we perform a simple likelihood analysis on the free parameters of the model with the combination of data from Type Ia Supernova (SN Ia), Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO) and Cosmic Microware Backround (CMB) radiation observations.

Firstly, we construct the following χ^2 function for SN Ia by using the recently released Union2.1 compilation with 580 data points

$$\chi^2_{SNIa} = P - \frac{Q^2}{R} \tag{44}$$

where P, Q and R are defined as

$$P = \sum_{i=0}^{580} \frac{(\mu_{th}(z_i) - \mu_{obs}(z_i))^2}{\sigma^2_\mu(z_i)}, \tag{45}$$

$$Q = \sum_{i=0}^{580} \frac{(\mu_{th}(z_i) - \mu_{obs}(z_i))}{\sigma^2_\mu(z_i)}, \tag{46}$$

$$R = \sum_{i=0}^{580} \frac{1}{\sigma^2_\mu(z_i)}, \tag{47}$$

with $\mu_{th} = 5\log_{10}\left[(1+z)\int_0^z \frac{H_0}{H(z')}dz'\right] + 25$ denotes the distance modulus predicted by theory and μ_{obs} represents the observed one with a statistical uncertainty σ_μ.



FIG. 2. The figure on the left shows observational constraints on parameters (λ, Ω_{m0}) with the combination of SN Ia and BAO/CMB detasets, in which the light blue and blue region are corresponding to 2σ and 1σ region respectively, while the black point (0.013,0.269) with $\chi^2 = 564.811$ represents the best-fit value of the pair (λ, Ω_{m0}), which is slightly favoured over that of the concordance ΛCDM model. The figure on the right shows marginalised likelihood function of λ with SN Ia+BAO/CMB detasets, which suggests $-0.017 < \lambda < 0.047$ (2σ confidence level).

In the second step, we consider BAO data from the WiggleZ Survey, SDSS DR7 Galaxy sample and 6dF Galaxy Survey together with CMB data from WMAP 7 yeas observations to obtain the BAO/CMB constraints on the model parameters by defining $\chi^2_{BAO/CMB}$ as[29–31]

$$\chi^2_{BAO/CMB} = X^T C^{-1} X \tag{48}$$

where

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{d_A(z_*)}{D_v(0.106)} - 30.95 \\ \frac{d_A(z_*)}{D_v(0.2)} - 17.55 \\ \frac{d_A(z_*)}{D_v(0.35)} - 10.11 \\ \frac{d_A(z_*)}{D_v(0.44)} - 8.44 \\ \frac{d_A(z_*)}{D_v(0.6)} - 6.69 \\ \frac{d_A(z_*)}{D_v(0.73)} - 5.45 \end{pmatrix} \tag{49}$$

in which $d_A(z) = \int_0^z \frac{1}{H(z')} dz'$ and $D_V(z) = \left[d_A(z)^2 \frac{z}{H(z)} \right]^{\frac{1}{3}}$ represent the co-moving angular-diameter distance and the dilation scale respectively, while $z_* \approx 1091$ is the decoupling time.

$$C^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.48435 & -0.101383 & -0.164945 & -0.0305703 & -0.097874 & -0.106738 \\ -0.101383 & 3.2882 & -2.45497 & -0.0787898 & -0.252254 & -0.2751 \\ -0.164945 & -2.45497 & 9.55916 & -0.128187 & -0.410404 & -0.447574 \\ -0.0305703 & -0.0787898 & -0.128187 & 2.78728 & -2.75632 & 1.16437 \\ -0.097874 & -0.252254 & -0.410404 & -2.75632 & 14.9245 & -7.32441 \\ -0.106738 & -0.2751 & -0.447574 & 1.16437 & -7.32441 & 14.5022 \end{pmatrix}$$

is the inverse of the correlation matrix.

Finally, the total χ^2 function for the combined observational datasets is given by $\chi^2 = \chi^2_{SNIa} + \chi^2_{BAO/CMA}$, from which we can construct the likelihood function as $L = L_0 e^{-\frac{1}{2}\chi^2}$, here L_0 is a normalized constant which is independent of the free parameters.

Providing with the likelihood function, one can then obtain the best-fit values of the free parameters by maximizing it. However, as was mentioned in the previous section, the parameter x_0 can't be strictly restricted, so we leave it out of the discussions and consider the likelihood function that has been marginalized over x_0. By the aid of (43), such function is proportional to

$$\lim_{x_0 \to +\infty} L(x_0, \lambda, \Omega_{m0}) \approx L(\tilde{x_0}, \lambda, \Omega_{m0}) \tag{50}$$



FIG. 3. $\delta = \lambda\frac{x'}{x}$ here represents the strength of the interactions, the blue, orange and green curve are corresponding to the case with $(\lambda, x_0, \Omega_{m0}) = (0.01, 0.6, 0.27), (0.01, 10, 0.27), (0.01, 100, 0.27)$ respectively.

where $\tilde{x_0}$ is a large number, one can choose it as 10000, for example. We now present the fitting result in Fig.2 by analyzing such likelihood. One can see from the result that observations favor a small positive coupling constant which, as we mentioned above, allows the existence of a tracking solution that can be used to alleviate the coincidence problem with a fine-turning of the model parameters.

On the other hand, observations doesn't exclude the probability of having a negative coupling constant which allows the effective EOS of dark energy pass through -1 at a low redshift.

Moreover, one thing here needs to be noticed, since x_0 can't be strictly restricted(in fact it can be any value beyond $x_* \approx 0.58$), the interact behavior between two dark sectors still remains uncertain, which can be inferred from Fig.3. However, one may decrease such uncertainty by taking into account observational constraints from matter density perturbations δ_m which is also affected by the presence of the interaction.

From Fig.3, it can be inferred that the direction of energy transfer can be changed if x_0 is sufficiently close to x_* and the behavior of δ is almost the same between the choices of $x_0 = 10$ and $x_0 = 100$ if the redshift $z > 0$, which is consistent with the conclusion that the



FIG. 4. The blue, orange and green line are corresponding to the case with $(\lambda, \Omega_{m0}) = (0.01, 0.3), (0.02, 0.3), (0.01, 0.2)$ respectively. Here x_0 ranges from 10 to 10000.

likelihood function becomes a constant with respect to x_0 if x_0 is adequately large that we have drawn in the section III. In fact we can prove this conclusion in a inductively way by plotting χ^2 (see Fig.4).

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have studied a power-law coupled dark energy model which considers dark energy as a three-form field and dark matter as a spinor field. By performing a dynamical analysis on the field equations with the introduction of three dimensionless variables, we obtained two fixed points of the autonomous system of evolution equations, among which one is a de Sitter attractor, and the other is a tracking solution, supposing $\lambda > 0$, that provides a possible solution of the coincidence problem. Moreover, we also obtained a approximate solution of the autonomous system which allows, if $\lambda < 0$, the effective EOS of dark energy passing through -1 at a low redshift by taking a large x_0.

By marginalizing over x_0, we have also carried out a likelihood analysis on the free parameters λ and Ω_{m0} with the combination of SN Ia+BAO/CMB datasets,through which we have a best-fit value of the pair (λ, Ω_{m0}) as $(0.013, 0.269)$. In addition, the likelihood function marginalized over x_0 and Ω_{m0} showed that λ is restricted by $-0.017 < \lambda < 0.047$

(2σ confidence level, with a best-fit value 0.01), indicating that although the concordance model still remains a good fit to the data, a positive coupling constant is slightly favoured over it.

Notwithstanding it can be told from the fitting result that λ and Ω_{m0} are strictly restricted, x_0 can be any value beyond $x_* \approx 0.58$. However, as mentioned above, by taking into account observational constraints from matter density perturbation δ_m, we may decrease the uncertainty on x_0.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors warmly thank Jia-Xin Wang and Deng Wang for beneficial discussions.

[1] A.G. Riess, A.V. Filippenko, P. Challis, A. Clocchiatti, A. Diercks, P.M. Garnavich, R.L. Gilliland, C.J. Hogan, S. Jha, R.P. Kirshner, et al., The Astronomical Journal **116**(3), 1009 (1998)

[2] S. Perlmutter, G. Aldering, G. Goldhaber, R. Knop, P. Nugent, P. Castro, S. Deustua, S. Fabbro, A. Goobar, D. Groom, et al., The Astrophysical Journal **517**(2), 565 (1999)

[3] V. Sahni, Lecture Notes in Physics **653**(2), 141 (2004)

[4] S.M. Carroll, Living Reviews in Relativity **4**(1), 1 (2000)

[5] R.R. Caldwell, R. Dave, P.J. Steinhardt, Physical Review Letters **80**(8), 1582 (1998)

[6] R.R. Caldwell, Phys.lett **45**(3), 549 (1999)

[7] F. Piazza, S. Tsujikawa, Journal of Cosmology Astroparticle Physics **2004**(7), 283 (2004)

[8] T. Padmanabhan, Physical Review D Particles Fields **66**(2), 611 (2002)

[9] F. Bo, M. Li, Y.S. Piao, X. Zhang, Physics Letters B **634**(2-3), 101 (2006)

[10] T.S. Koivisto, D.F. Mota, C. Pitrou, Journal of High Energy Physics **2009**(9), (2009)

[11] T.S. Koivisto, N.J. Nunes, Physics Letters B **685**(2-3), 105 (2009)

[12] T.S. Koivisto, N.J. Nunes, Physical Review D **88**(12), 72 (2012)

[13] L. Amendola, Physical Review D **62**(4), 2000 (1999)

[14] T. Ngampitipan, P. Wongjun, Journal of Cosmology Astroparticle Physics **11**(11), 2403 (2011)

[15] S. Micheletti, E. Abdalla, B. Wang, Phys.rev.d **79**(12), 180 (2009)

[16] N. Suzuki, D. Rubin, C. Lidman, G. Aldering, R. Amanullah, K. Barbary, L.F. Barrientos, J. Botyanszki, M. Brodwin, N. Connolly, Astrophysical Journal **746**(1) (2012)

[17] B. Chris, E.A. Kazin, B. Florian, T.M. Davis, P. David, B. Sarah, C. Matthew, C. Carlos, C. Warrick, C. Scott, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society **418**(3), 1707 (2011)

[18] W.J. Percival, B.A. Reid, D.J. Eisenstein, N.A. Bahcall, T. Budavari, J.A. Frieman, M. Fukugita, J.E. Gunn, x d;eljko Ivezix, G.R. Knapp, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society **401**(4), 2148C2168 (2010)

[19] F. Beutler, C. Blake, M. Colless, D.H. Jones, L. Staveleysmith, L. Campbell, Q. Parker, W. Saunders, F. Watson, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society **416**(4), 3017C3032 (2011)

[20] N. Jarosik, C. Bennett, J. Dunkley, B. Gold, M. Greason, M. Halpern, R. Hill, G. Hinshaw, A. Kogut, E. Komatsu, et al., The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series **192**(2), 14 (2011)

[21] S. Weinberg, American Journal of Physics **41**(4) (1973)

[22] N.D. Birrell, P.C.W. Davies, *Quantum fields in curved space*. 7 (Cambridge university press, 1984)

[23] R. Wald, Chicago. Sect **6** (1984)

[24] L.H. Ryder, *Quantum field theory* (Cambridge university press, 1996)

[25] T.S. Koivisto, N.J. Nunes, Physical Review D Particles Fields **80**(10), 363 (2009)

[26] P. Wang, X.H. Meng, Classical Quantum Gravity **22**(2), 283 (2004)

[27] H. Wei, S.N. Zhang, Physics Letters B **644**(1), 7 (2007)

[28] L. Amendola, G.C. Campos, R. Rosenfeld, Physical Review D **75**(8), 083506 (2007)

[29] R. Giostri, M.V.D. Santos, I. Waga, R.R.R. Reis, M.O. Calvão, B.L. Lago, Physics **2012**(03) (2012)

[30] A.A. Mamon, K. Bamba, S. Das, European Physical Journal C **77**(1), 29 (2016)

[31] A.A. Mamon, S. Das, International Journal of Modern Physics D **25**(03) (2016)